

REMARKS

In response to the Examiners office action dated February 21, 2006, Applicants have hereby submitted this Request for Continued Examination so that the Examiner may consider the claims as modified herein. In regard to the various rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicants have modified the claims in order to overcome these rejections. Applicants submit that the modified claims comport with all of the requirements of section 112. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicants' presently claimed invention. More specifically, Applicants have modified the independent claims to specifically require that the first organic material is exclusively transported via a carrier gas stream into a chamber containing the substrate. The step of depositing the second organic material is comprised of exclusively transporting the second organic material via a carrier gas stream into the chamber containing the substrate. Applicants have also specified that the first organic material is different from the second organic material. See, for example claim 1.

Additionally, claim 11 has been modified to also specify that each of the first and second organic material layers are deposited in the chamber while no other material is present other than the organic material being deposited and its carrier gas. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest the presently claimed invention.

In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the references of record provide no teaching her suggestion whatsoever regarding the exclusive transport and deposition of single organic material layers. The cited references which the Examiner has applied in rejecting the claims are no different than the prior art described in the background of the invention section for this application. Applicant's deposition technique provides a substantial improvement over these known prior art solutions such as organic vapor phase deposition wherein the reactor is supplied with a plurality of organic precursor substances in vapor phase and they react with each other so that the organic reaction produces a deposited layer. As noted on page 3, for example, this prior art solution suffers from the problem that the organic precursor substances do not mix homogenously in the reactor or there is an uneven temperature distribution in the reactor even in the case of homogenous mixing.

The reaction is therefore irregular which leads to a variation in the quality of the organic thin film formed on the substrate. Applicants presently claimed invention does not suffer from these and other shortcomings described in pages 1-4.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Date:

7/21/06

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Robert Depke, Reg. No. 37,607

Paige A. Kitzinger, Reg. No. 45,219

**ROCKEY, DEPKE, LYONS
& KITZINGER LLC**

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 5450

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Page 8